



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,700	09/24/2001	Wilson Burgess	CI-0010	4269

34610 7590 09/29/2003

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER

MCKANE, ELIZABETH L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1744

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/960,700

Applicant(s)

BURGESS ET AL.

Examiner

Leigh McKane

Art Unit

1744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-87 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-63 and 65-87 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 64 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5-7,9,11-13
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5, 17-27, 30, 31, 36-42, 50-52, 54-63, 66-75, 86, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Peterson (U.S. Patent No. 5,730,933).

Peterson teaches the use of e-beam or gamma radiation to sterilize a biological material that is sensitive to radiation, wherein a stabilizer (antioxidant/free-radical scavenger, such as ascorbate or propyl galate) is added to the material prior to irradiation and the material is then irradiated “under standard sterilization conditions...at an intensity and for a time duration sufficient to destroy substantially all of the microorganism contamination” (col.4, lines 59-64). See also col.4, lines 36-51; col.6, lines 1-18. The material may also be lyophilized or dried with drying agents and/or frozen and placed under a vacuum or inert gas, such as nitrogen or argon (col.4, lines 51-58; col.5, lines 28-35 and lines 53-67). The sterilized tissue may be used to treat a disease or deficiency. See col.3, lines 3-7.

3. Claims 1, 12-16, 49, 53, 74, and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Odland (U.S. Patent No. 5,989,498).

Odland teaches the sterilization of sensitive biological materials at ambient temperature to slightly above ambient (col.4, lines 35-37 and 48-51) with e-beam radiation. Prior to radiation, the biological material is stabilized (cross-linked) with a stabilizer mixture (cross-linking agents). See col.7, lines 38-58. The material is then irradiated with e-beam radiation at a

Art Unit: 1744

dose rate of 2.2×10^4 kGy/hr (col.3, line 24). The sterilized material may be used to treat a human. See col.1, lines 14-23.

4. Claims 54, 55, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Horowitz et al (U.S. Patent No.5,981,163).

Horowitz et al teaches mixtures of sensitive biological materials with stabilizer mixtures and sensitizers that ultimately undergo radiation sterilization. See Abstract. The stabilizer can be glutathione or vitamins, among others. The biological material may be immunoglobulins (col.5, lines 66-67).

5. Claims 1, 33, and 34 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wieseahn et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,727,027).

Wieseahn et al teaches a method for sterilizing biological materials with UV radiation at a controlled rate and for a time sufficient to sterilize the material. See col.4, lines 20-40. A sensitizer and/or oxygen scavenger may be added to the material before irradiation and preferably the material is irradiated at a temperature below 60 °C, most preferably -10 to 30 °C. A stabilizer (heparin) is added to control any activated clotting factors (col.11, lines 31-33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1744

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 6, 7, 28, 29, 32, 35, and 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Horowitz et al.

As to claims 6 and 7, although Peterson fails to teach removal of an organic solvent from the biological material, Horowitz et al discloses that it was known in the art to combine the treatment of a biological material with irradiation and a stabilizer mixture with a second virucidal treatment such as, treatment with an organic (lipid) solvent. See col.7, line 66 to col.8, line 8. As such merely improves the virucidal effectiveness of the method of Peterson it would have been obvious to first treat the biological material with the organic solvent, followed by removal prior to irradiation. Moreover, in col.6, lines 16-19, Horowitz et al teaches that it was known in

Art Unit: 1744

the art to obtain plasma fractions by treating the blood for organic solvents such as ethanol and PEG to effect precipitation of a desired fraction. The obtained fraction is subsequently treated by the sterilization method of Horowitz et al.

With respect to claims 28, 29, 32, and 35, Peterson does not teach adding a sensitizer to the material prior to irradiation or a stabilizer mixture. Horowitz et al, however, teaches a method of sterilizing sensitive biological materials wherein a sensitizer and a stabilizer mixture is preferably added prior to irradiation. See Abstract; col.3, lines 34-39, lines 45-47, lines 60-62. As the sensitizer combined with radiation is disclosed to kill viruses without undue damage to the valuable biological material, it would have been an obvious addition to the method of Peterson. Moreover, since Horowitz et al teaches that a combination stabilizer quenches both free radicals and reactive forms of oxygen and thus, achieves preferential damage to the virus, it would have been obvious to use such in the method of Peterson.

As to claims 43-48, Peterson is silent with respect to using radiation other than gamma or e-beam radiation. Horowitz et al discloses that the use of a stabilizer is combinable with many forms of radiation sterilization. Horowitz et al evidences "Non-limiting examples ...UV ... gamma-irradiation, x-rays, and visible light" (col.6, lines 46-54) and teaches that "'irradiation' is to be construed broadly to include any from of radiation conventionally used to inactivate cells..." Thus, it is deemed to employ other types of radiation in the method of Peterson, as taught by Horowitz et al.

10. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Kent (U.S. Patent No. 6,171,549).

Peterson teaches irradiation "under standard sterilization conditions...at an intensity and

Art Unit: 1744

for a time duration sufficient to destroy substantially all of the microorganism contamination” (col.4, lines 59-64). Peterson does not specify what the intensity (dose rate) is. Kent, however, teaches that when sterilizing sensitive biological materials with gamma radiation, one should choose a low dose rate (0.1-3.0 kGy/hr). See Abstract. As this dose rate is disclosed by Kent to be effective in sterilizing without undue damage to the biological material, it would have been obvious to use in Peterson.

11. Claims 74-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz et al in view of Kent.

Horowitz et al teaches the sterilization of biological materials, including blood products, wherein the material is treated with a stabilizer mixture and irradiated with gamma radiation. Horowitz et al does not disclose controlling the dose rate. However, Kent, teaches that when sterilizing sensitive biological materials with gamma radiation, one should choose a low dose rate (0.1-3.0 kGy/hr). See Abstract. As this dose rate is disclosed by Kent to be effective in sterilizing without undue damage to the biological material, it would have been obvious to use in the method of Horowitz et al. Moreover, as Horowitz et al discloses the sterilization of a variety of blood products, cells, proteins, and biological fluids and the subsequent use of those materials to treat humans, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to sterilize any biological material intended for use in the treatment of disease.

Art Unit: 1744

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claim 64 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


13. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:
The prior art fails to teach or suggest a biological material that is glassy or vitrified.

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leigh McKane whose telephone number is 703-305-3387. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Wednesday (7:15 am-4:45 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert J. Warden can be reached on 703-308-2920. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.


Leigh McKane
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1744

elm
25 September 2003